I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4).

Dated: December 18, 2009

Electronic Signature for Sharon M. Sintich: /Sharon M. Sintich/

Docket No.: 01017/40451C (PATENT)

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Manfred Brockhaus et al. Confirmation No.: 5613

Application No.: 08/444,791 Art Unit: 1644

Filed: May 19, 1995 Examiner: R. B. Schwadron

For: HUMAN TNF RECEPTOR

## RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT WITH TRAVERSE

MS Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This is a response to the Restriction Requirement mailed November 25, 2009. The Examiner required election of one of the following species: pCD4Hγ1 vector and pCD4Hγ3 vector. Applicants hereby elect the species of pCD4Hγ1 for continued examination, with traverse. All of the pending claims read on the elected species. Claims 148, 149, 217, 218, 226, 227, 236, 237, 247, 248, 256 and 257 particularly recite the pCD4Hγ1 vector, while all other claims are generic in regards to the vector.

Applicants traverse this restriction requirement as untimely because claims reciting the two vectors were pending in this application since December 9, 2004, and the Examiner has mailed a number of restriction requirements since that date. In addition, if the species are few in number or so closely related that a search and examination of the entire claim can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine all species. See M.P.E.P. § 803.02. In this case, search and examination based on both vector species would not be a serious burden on the Examiner. Furthermore, if the elected species and/or a generic claim is found to be patentable, the prior art search and examination must be extended to the other species. See M.P.E.P. §§ 803.02 and 809.02(a).

Application No.: 08/444,791 Docket No.: 01017/40451C

For these reasons, Applicants believe that the most expeditious method of examination is for the Examiner to examine the two vector species simultaneously. Applicants request that the restriction be withdrawn.

Dated: December 18, 2009 Respectfully submitted,

By /Sharon M. Sintich/
Sharon M. Sintich
Registration No.: 48,484
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant